

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 1 is amended to clarify in the preamble that the multilayer structure is resinous, thereby excluding, for example, a metal support. Claims 2-6 are amended accordingly to be consistent with the amendment to Claim 1.

Entry of the Amendment along with reconsideration and review of the claims on the merits are respectfully requested.

***Preliminary Matter***

Although the Examiner indicates that an Information Disclosure Statement is returned with the Office Action, Applicants did not receive a copy and, therefore, request that the Examiner consider and return an initialed copy of the IDS submitted on July 29, 2003.

***Statement of Summary of Examiner's Interview***

Applicants kindly appreciate that the Examiner conducted a personal interview with Applicants' representative on November 6, 2003, subsequent to the mailing of the Final Office Action on September 5, 2003.

Applicants point to the Examiner's Interview Summary as a summary of the discussion during the interview, with the following notes.

Applicants' representative notes that the date of the interview was originally scheduled for November 5, 2003, as indicated on the Interview Summary Form PTOL-413, but the date was rescheduled to November 6, 2003.

In the enclosed copy of the Interview Summary, Applicants appreciate that the Examiner "agreed to withdraw the rejections." As a summary, Applicants' representative pointed out that

the optical light diffusion multilayered transparent support in Beeson does not meet Ra of 0.8 nm or lower, and that even though conventional resin substrates may be used in the prior art, the Ra of the epoxy resin layers in the prior art are quite different from the Ra of the present invention when formed by the flow casting technique. Applicants reserve the right to traverse Beeson and any secondary references in detail if the rejection is maintained or if the Examiner poses new grounds of rejection.

In the description of the general nature of what was agreed to, the Examiner wrote “Applicant pointed to Beeson’s surface roughness limitation (1-20  $\mu$ m) is not in the range of 0.8 nm or less. Applicant pointed to Comparative Examples that teach .8 nm or less is a result effective parameter to help eliminate leakage. Office suggested amending the specification that all the resinous layers are the substrate and not support (1) not of any other material [sic]. [Examiner] agreed to withdraw the rejections.” The Examiner pointed out that on page 5 at lines 20-23, element 1 is also described as a “substrate 1”.

Applicants have amended the specification in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion to clarify that the resinous multilayer structure excludes, for example, a metal support. Applicants amend the term to “~~substrate~~ support 1” on page 5. This amendment to the specification is consistent with the description of element 1 as the support in the specification, for example, in the previous paragraph on page 5. No new matter is added.

Applicants also amend Claim 1 to recite, “A resinous ~~substrate~~ multilayer structure for optical use which comprises...”, to clarify that the belt support would not be claimed in the

**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116**

U.S. Application No. 09/769,376

**Q62053**

multilayer structure, as suggested by the Examiner's supervisor. Claims 2-6 are amended to be consistent with the amendment to Claim 1 for having proper antecedent basis.

Applicants' representative did not describe, or intend to describe, the claimed surface roughness range as a "result-effective variable" as indicated in error in the Examiner's Interview Summary.


Applicants earnestly request the allowability of pending claims 1-6.

***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



John K. Shin  
Registration No. 48,409

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 3, 2003